



★
No. 4377-225





TOWNSHIP ORGANIZATION

FOR

ILLINOIS,

OR

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

FOR

4377-225

THE PEOPLE.

BY A FARMER.

"The riches of the commonwealth
Are free, strong minds and hearts of health."

"To me more fair
Than gay Versailles or Windsor's halls,
The painted, shingled town-house where
The freeman's vote for Freedom falls."

WHITTIER.

ALTON, ILL.,

COURIER STEAM BOOK AND JOB PRINTING HOUSE.

1859.

"THERE are two subjects, indeed, which I shall claim a right to further as long as I breathe: the public education and the subdivision of counties into wards; I consider the continuance of Republican government as absolutely hanging on these two hooks."

—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

"IN all countries and in all companies for several years, I have, in conversation and in writing, enumerated the towns, militia, schools and churches, as the four causes of the growth and defense of New England."—JOHN ADAMS.

"LOCAL self-government was the aim of the colonies. Opposition to centralization of authority is very old in America. I hope it will be always young."—THEODORE PARKER.

Class of 1854
TOWNSHIP ORGANIZATION

FOR

ILLINOIS,

OR

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

FOR

4377.225

THE PEOPLE.

BY A FARMER.

"The riches of the commonwealth
Are free, strong minds and hearts of health."

"To me more fair
Than gay Versailles or Windsor's halls,
The painted, shingled town-house where
The freeman's vote for Freedom falls."

WHITTIER.

ALTON, ILL.,

COURIER STEAM BOOK AND JOB PRINTING HOUSE.

1859

From 4477.34
357.765
Jan. 3, 1885

WASSEL CLEVER
ENT TO
NOTES TO

TOWNSHIP ORGANIZATION FOR ILLINOIS.

Man is an individual and a social being. His individuality requires freedom from unnecessary restraint for its full development; his social instinct necessitates society. Society for its proper organization and healthful existence needs government to protect rights, and enforce the performance of duties. Man, then, desires, or should desire, the greatest freedom consistent with public order.

Governments, generally speaking, are of three kinds, as regards the source of the ruling power:

FIRST—Monarchy, or the Rule of One.

SECOND—Oligarchy, or the Rule of the Few.

THIRD—Democracy, or the Rule of the People.

Each of these three kinds of government may be *absolute* or *limited*, according to the restrictions of constitutions and the combination with other kinds, or the contrary; and each may be *centralized* or *localized*, according to the mode of its action. Absolute and centralized governments have generally proved themselves brilliant and ruinous in able hands, and feeble and insufficient, when the weak held the reins; limited and local governments have been the characteristic of such countries as England and Switzerland, that, fast-anchored in the stormy sea of present European troubles, bear up the cheering signal lights of Liberty and Law.

The principle of Monarchical governments, according to MONTESQUIEU, is Honor; that of an Oligarchy, is Moderation; that of a Democracy, Virtue.* The last demands the most of the people. "Freedom," says JOSIAH QUINCY, "has no perfect security but Virtue; Virtue none but Knowledge." Knowledge, Virtue, Freedom, Material Prosperity, should be both the means and end of a good Democratic government. And such is ours, by the acts of our fathers and the consent of their posterity.

Our fathers acted with equal wisdom, in declaring themselves against Centralization, and in favor of the diffusion of political power among the States. Posterity, also, sustains this decision.

* Esprit des Lois, Liv. III, Chap. 3.

The same question of Centralization or Diffusion, Federalism or Republicanism, comes up in organizing the government of a single State and County. And here I arrive at the question I propose to discuss. *Is local self-government preferable to general government?*

I affirm that it is.

FIRST—Because it is abstractly considered most likely to increase Knowledge, promote Virtue, enlarge the Liberties, and increase the material Prosperity of the people among whom it exists. The Argument from Theory.

SECOND—Because the most eminent writers, who have expressed an opinion on the subject, have *without exception* declared themselves in its favor. The Argument from Authority.

THIRD—Because an examination into its history and workings in our own and other countries, prove it *experimentally* to be the best. The Argument from Experience.

I. It seems reasonable that local self-government should be the best for the following reasons:

1. It increases Knowledge. In a country where every voter is also a legislator, he becomes acquainted with parliamentary forms, with the laws, and with the transaction of public business. A small State is formed, whose simple machinery of government, every voter comes to comprehend, and comprehending which he can appreciate and judge the movements of more general governments, resist their insidious encroachments, and preserve his own liberties. He will have, not unfrequently, the training of office, and his knowledge of political affairs proportionably increased.

2. It promotes Virtue. In small communities, men are more apt to rise above the considerations of general parties, and to elect their best men to the most important offices; which they are enabled to do from a personal knowledge of the candidates. The emoluments of office will not tempt unprincipled men, and its duties are not so onerous that good citizens cannot discharge them without neglecting their own affairs. Order is generally better preserved, more exact justice meted out, and violations of law more severely and summarily punished, where the immediate neighborhood is the governing power. The people are more identified with the government as actual or possible officers, and feel at once a pride and a personal interest in thorough administration. Again, the great moral power of the rural districts is thus organized to act in concert against the frequent immorality and lawlessness of the great cities. It rouses their energies, calls out their voters, and presents an insuperable barrier to corruption.

3. It enlarges the liberties of the citizens. It give them sole control of affairs, peculiarly their own. Communities without do not direct such affairs as road-making, bridge-building, police, and pauperism. They are left to those whom it concerns.

4. It increases material prosperity. It is more economical, first, from throwing the offices into the rural districts, where their support is less expensive; and secondly from putting them under

the immediate eye of the electors.* For the latter reason, it will also be more thoroughly administered. It creates a local public spirit, which, if sometimes narrow and selfish, does, nevertheless, much good for the community.

II. For these and other reasons, eminent writers upon politics, have quite invariably given their testimony in its favor.

1. Said JOHN ADAMS, in a letter to the ABBE DE MABLY, written in 1782, (Works Vol. V, p. 494):

"The towns are certain extents of country or districts of territory into which Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, are divided. These towns contain, upon an average, says six miles, or two leagues square. The inhabitants who live within these limits are formed by law into corporations, or bodies politic, and are invested with certain powers and privileges, as for example, to repair the great roads or highways, to support the poor, to choose their Selectmen, Constables, Collectors of Taxes, and above all, their Representatives to the Legislature; as also the right to assemble whenever they are summoned by their Selectmen, in their Town Halls, there to deliberate upon the public affairs of the town, or to give instructions to their Representatives in the Legislature. The consequences of these institutions have been that the inhabitants, having acquired from their infancy, the habit of discussing and deliberating, and of judging public affairs, it was in these assemblies, and towns or districts that the sentiments of the people were formed in the first place, and their resolutions were taken from the beginning to the end of the disputes and the war with Great Britain."

Mr. ADAMS elsewhere speaks of the New England towns as—

"Little democracies, that have rocked the Cradle of Liberty, and trained the people to the practice of public affairs."

2. THOMAS JEFFERSON, without Mr. ADAMS' experience, (the subdivisions of Virginia being counties merely,) arrived theoretically and by observation, at the same conclusions. In a letter to SAMUEL KERCHEVAL, on the Constitution of Virginia, written in 1816, (Works, Vol. VII, p. 9; and RANDALL'S Life, Vol. III, p. 649,) he says:

"Divide the counties into wards of such size as that every citizen can attend when called on, and act in person. Ascribe to them the government of their wards in all things relating to themselves exclusively. A Justice chosen by themselves, in each; a Constable, a Military Company, a Patrol, a School; the care of their own poor; their own portion of the public roads; the choice of one or more jurors to serve in some Court, and the delivery, within their own wards, of their own votes for all elective officers of higher sphere, will relieve the county administration of nearly all its business, will have it better done, and, by making every citizen an acting member of the government, and in the offices nearest and most interesting him, will attach him, by his strongest feelings to the independence of his country and its republican Constitution. * * * * * These wards, called townships in New England, are the vital principle of their governments, and have proved themselves the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government, and for its preservation. We should thus marshal our government into—

1. The general Federal Republic, for all concerns foreign and federal;
2. That of the State, for what relates to our own citizens exclusively;

* "There is," says a gentleman of Connecticut, "more of a check on improper conduct, where every officer is known by nearly every voter, than in the county system, where, to all save those of his own town, he is a stranger. If you want economy, honesty, efficiency, try our system, and you will have them."

3. The County Republic, for the duties and concerns of the county; and
4. The Ward Republics, for the small, and yet numerous and interesting concerns of the neighborhood; and in government, as well as in every other business of life, it is by division and subdivision of duties, alone, that all matters, great and small, can be managed to perfection. And the whole is cemented by giving to each citizen, personally, a part in the administration of public affairs."

In a letter written the same year, to J. C. CABELL, (Works, Vol. VI, p. 540,) he bears witness to the political strength given to a State, by the town system:

"Where every man is a sharer in the direction of his ward-republic, or of some of the higher ones, and feels that he is a participator in the government of affairs, not merely at an election one day in the year, but every day; when there shall not be a man in the State who will not be a member of some one of its councils, great or small, he will let the heart be torn out of his body sooner than his power be wrested from him by a Cæsar or a Bonaparte. How powerfully did we feel the energy of this organization in the case of embargo? I felt the foundations of the government shaken under my feet by the New England townships. There was not an individual in their States whose body was not thrown, with all its momentum, into action; and although the whole of the other States were known to be in favor of the measure, yet the organization of this little selfish minority enabled it to overrule the Union. What would the unwieldy counties of the Middle, the South, and the West do? Call a county meeting, and the drunken loungers at and about the Court House would have collected, the distances be too great for the good people and the industrious to attend. The character of those who really met would have been the measure of the weight they would have had in the scale of public opinion. As Cato, then, concluded every speech with the words: 'CARTHAGO DELEND A EST,' so I (?) every opinion with the injunction, 'divide the counties into wards.'"

Such were the views of ADAMS and JEFFERSON—the New Englander and Virginian—the second and third President of the United States—"The Great Twin Brethren" of the Revolution.

3. M. DE TOCQUEVILLE, the eminent French writer on Government, gives his testimony in the following words: (Democracy in America, Chap. V, Part I.)

"Local assemblies of citizens constitute the strength of free nations. Municipal institutions are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring it within the people's reach, they teach men how to use and how to enjoy it. A nation may establish a system of free government, but, without the spirit of municipal institutions, it cannot have the spirit of liberty. * * * * * The native of New England is attached to his township because it is independent and free; his co-operation in its affairs ensures his attachment to its interest; the well-being it affords him secures his affection; and its welfare is the aim of his ambition and of his future exertions; he takes a part in every occurrence in the place; he practices the art of government in the small sphere within his reach; he accustoms himself to those forms which can alone ensure the steady progress of liberty; he imbibes their spirit; he acquires a taste for order, comprehends the union of the balance of power, and collects clear, practical notions of his duties and the extent of his rights."

4. M. DE MALESHERBES, the French statesman, (quoted by M. DE TOCQUEVILLE,) speaking in 1775, in the name of the *Cour des Aides*, concerning the municipalities of France, said to Louis XIV:

"Every corporation, and every community of citizens, retained the right of administering its own affairs; a right which not only forms part of the primitive constitution of the kingdom, but has a still higher origin; for it is the right of nature and of reason."

5. Our own Chancellor KENT, (quoted by Mr. HAINES, in his "Compilation of all the General Laws of the State of Illinois, relative to Township Organization,") says:

"The establishment of towns with corporate powers, as local republics, was the original policy throughout New England, and it had a durable and benign effect upon the institutions, and moral and social character of the people."

6. DANIEL WEBSTER, in his Plymouth Address, of 1820, used the following language:

"Great facility has been given to this (system of representation) in New England, by the early division of the country into townships or small districts, in which all concerns of local police are regulated, and in which Representatives to the Legislature are elected. Nothing can exceed the utility of these little bodies. They are so many Councils or Parliaments, in which common interests are discussed, and useful knowledge acquired and communicated."

In more general terms, but with greater force, he expressed similar views at the Pilgrim Festival, in New York City, in 1843:

"Circumstances have wrought out for us a state of things, which, in other times and other regions, philosophy has dreamed of, and theory has proposed, and speculation has suggested, but which man has never been able to accomplish. I mean the government of a great nation, over a vastly extended portion of the earth, by means of local institutions for local purposes, and general institutions for general purposes. I know of nothing in the history of the world, notwithstanding the great league of the Grecian States, notwithstanding the success of the Roman System, (and certainly there is no exception to the remark in modern history,) I know nothing more suitable, on the whole, for the great interests of a great people, spread over a large portion of the globe, as the provision of a local legislation for local and municipal purposes, with, not a confederacy, nor a loose binding together of separate parts; but a limited, positive, general government for positive general purposes, over the whole."

7. M. GUIZOT, in his "Memoirs," (quoted in the *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1858,) with his usual felicity, points out the advantages of local government and the difficulties of centralization:

"Where administration and policy are equally free, where local affairs are discussed and decided by local authorities and influences, and neither derive their solution from the central power, which never interferes except when the general interests of the State absolutely requires it to do so,—as in England, and in the United States of America, in Holland, and Belgium, for instance—the representative system readily accords with an administrative government, which never appeals to its co-operation, except on important and rare occasions. But when the supreme authority undertakes, at the same time to govern with freedom, and administer by centralization—when it has to contend at the seat of power, for the great affairs of the State, and to regulate, under its own responsibility, in all the departments, the minor business of every district—two weighty objections immediately present themselves; either the central power, absorbed by the care of National questions, and occupied with its own defence, neglects local affairs, and suffers them to fall into disorder and inaction; or, it connects them closely with general questions, making them subservient to its own interests; and thus the whole system of administration, from the hamlet to the palace, degenerates into an implement of government in the hands of political parties, who are mutually contending for power."

8. Dr. LIEBER, in his "Civil Liberty," (Vol. 1, p. 351,) says:

Self-government, to be of a penetrative character, requires the institutional

self-government of the country or district; it requires that everything, which, without general inconvenience, can be left to the circle to which it belongs, be thus left to its own management; it consists in the prosecuting, grand jury, in the petty jury, in the fact that much which is called, on the European continent, the administrative branch, be left to the people. It requires, in one word, all the local appliances of government, which are termed local self-government; and Niebuhr says that British liberty depends, at least, as much on these, as on Parliament, and in contra-distinction to them, he calls the governments of the continent *Staats-Regierungen*, (State governments,) meaning governments directing all detail by the general and supreme power."

In the Massachusetts Convention for the forming of a new Constitution, in 1853, the following gentlemen, in discussing the new basis of representation, gave their testimony incidentally, in regard to their town system:

9. The Hon. GEO. S. HILLARD, (the eminent lawyer and author,) said:

"Without municipal institutions there is no constitutional liberty. These local, separate and independent assemblies, through which the life-blood of the nation flows and circulates, in which matters are discussed important enough to awaken interest, yet not important enough to arouse ambition, are the fountains from which our political prosperity has flowed. May they remain as pure as they have hitherto been.

10. The Hon. WHITING GRISWOLD said:

"There is a strong natural tendency in towns to equality and Republicanism, and Democratic forms of government. All men meet in town meetings upon a level—the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the learned and the ignorant. What a model for a government."

11. The same gentleman read an abstract from a letter written by "a distinguished son of Virginia" whom he did not feel permitted to name, in which the latter says:

"My admiration of your townships is perfectly unabated, since I had the pleasure of seeing you at Pittsfield. They are models after the plan of King Alfred's hundreds, and organized as you have them, are small republics that constitute the main strength, to use Mr. Jefferson's expression, of the larger one. I should be sorry to see anything done to break down their organization. I ascribe to their influence much of the prosperity of the Eastern States, and most of their power in the affairs of the Union."

12. The Hon. RUFUS CHOATE, who was in this Convention, spoke as follows:

"The system is this: The inhabitants of the towns, as such, are charged with certain public affairs, by the care of which they become trained to business, instructed, elevated. What are these affairs? Education; pauperism; the care of the public ways; the police of the town; its finances; the election of its officers; the giving of votes for officers to represent the people in the government. To administer these affairs, they meet in town meeting; they think and exchange opinions; they discuss and decide. And thus they become accustomed to business; to the formation and expression of thoughts; to know, and feel, and act out what is meant by public life, as distinct from the selfishness and insulation of mere personal toil for personal gain. Besides all this, they have ever been accustomed occasionally to meet and consider of those subjects of extraordinary interest, by which the nation or the State is from time to time agitated; and such meetings have also formed part of the same general discipline."

13. The Hon. BENJ. F. HALLET remarked:

"And now let me say in conclusion, that, regarding these little republics of towns as the very elements of our most wholesome, moral, and political institutions, as the altars upon which are annually offered incense to patriotism, which, like devotion, is strengthened by frequent ritual observance, and from the practice of which, for centuries, by the congregations in town meeting assembled, we have been made such a people as we are, let us stand here to-day firmly upon the old principle of corporate representation for the towns."

14. The Hon. CHAS. W. UPHAM, of Salem, said:

"No gentleman has expressed, no one can express, stronger sentiments than I entertain of the part which those towns have played from the beginning in the history of this Commonwealth. They have been, indeed, pure and real Democracies, popular sovereignties, and schools of self-government. Through them, the people of this Commonwealth have been indoctrinated, generation after generation, in the great principles of law and liberty, of freedom and order. The organization of the small towns of this Commonwealth has been the instrumentality through which the people have been trained in attachment to the great principle of equality, and they have been taught that principle in combination with a respect for the wisdom of years, and the lessons of experience. In the small towns, the people of Massachusetts have been made familiar with the general rules that regulate popular assemblies, the leading principles of parliamentary law, and in that way they have been enabled from the first, with great facility and entire success, to accomplish the difficult work of bringing out a clear and certain expression of the popular will."

15. The Hon. CHARLES SUMNER, (now United States Senator,) said:

"I agree, cordially, that the towns in Massachusetts, like the municipalities of Switzerland, have been schools and nurseries of freedom; and that in these small bodies, men were early disciplined in those primal duties of citizenship, which, on a grander scale, have been made the foundation of our whole political fabric."

16. The Hon. MARCUS MORTON, said:

"The importance of these municipal corporations nobody will question. Nobody has a higher opinion of their utility, nobody attributes more to the prosperity of the Commonwealth to these municipalities than I do, and nobody has a higher opinion of their use in inculcating and establishing Democratic principles. * * * * *

The subject of establishing by-laws and adopting petitions and remonstrances to the State or federal government, and the passing of approbatory or denunciatory resolves often come before town meetings, and open for discussion the science of government and whole range of politics. In these assemblies are learned the rudiments of legislation, and the mode of transacting public business. Here are trained and prepared the future governors, judges, and legislators of the Commonwealth. No one appreciates these Democratic schools more than I do, or would be more unwilling to destroy or diminish their power and usefulness."

17. THEODORE PARKER, in a speech delivered at Boston in May, 1858, says, in speaking of American institutions:

"We have the foremost form of Political Institutions, with local self-government as Ideal; we take that for the equivalent of Freedom, while centralized government by others we look on as the same with slavery."

Such have been the views without known exception of some of the wisest and best men of our own and other countries in the

present and past generations. Differing widely on other political questions, they pronounce without exception in favor of local self-government, as maintaining the Liberty, fostering the Virtue, and increasing the Intelligence of the People.

III. We come now to the facts of local self-government, as seen in the history of the old world and the new, and as regulated by our State laws. These can be but briefly and imperfectly reviewed.

The Attic "demes" established by KLEISTHENES, five centuries before Christ, appear to have been the earliest form of a regular and continuous local self-government. These had their own corporations, property, magistrates, treasuries, and temples; and in annual meetings elected officers, revised their registry of voters, leased estates, furnished money and troops for the State, and awarded honorary distinctions to the meritorious. The Roman colonies, although in a centralized empire, appear to have chosen their own laws and magistrates, though they probably never attained the local freedom of the Grecian demes. The free cities of the Middle Ages were often permitted to have their own choice of magistrates, representation, a common property and seal, exemption from royal jurisdiction and tribute, and settled rules of inheritance. Modern European civilization, tending as it often has to centralization and the destruction to local liberties, presents fewer examples of local self-government than could be desired. Switzerland, however, in her smaller "Cantons" and the "Gemeinde" or "Communes" of her larger Cantons appears to have kept alive with her indomitable spirit of liberty much the same system of local self-government as we see in the United States. England, too, in her "parishes," presents a less perfect but still an analogous system, giving control of the roads, poor, &c., to authorities elected by the inhabitants.

Between all these various ancient, mediæval and modern forms of the same system, there appears to be no connection or historical continuity. They are related only as originating in the same desire for liberty and well-being—a desire common to the race, though in Europe never well made a fact. "The political existence of the majority of the nations of Europe," says DE TOCQUEVILLE, "commenced in the superior ranks of society, and was gradually and always imperfectly communicated to the different members of the social body. In America, on the other hand, it may be said that the township was organized before the State—the State before the Union."

"Freedom," says HEEREN, "ripens in colonies." Accordingly, when our Anglo-Saxon ancestors established themselves in America, they adopted Republican forms of government almost instinctively, and were really self-governed long before the Revolution. This was particularly the case in New England. Its settlers were Englishmen and Puritans; therefore freemen, and not over fond of Kings. They were small landholders on a sterile soil, and settled by companies in townships. Religion, to a cer-

tain extent, diminished the distinctions of wealth. In Virginia, the case was somewhat different. Here were loyal Cavaliers settling a fertile country where the production of the profitable staple of tobacco induced the cultivation of large and isolated estates by hired or slave labor. The settlers of Virginia were thus less associated in politics, and less Democratic in their disposition. Out of one state of things grew the township system; out of the other, that of the county. Thus began a divergence in the internal polity of Massachusetts and Virginia, which, from various causes, has extended to their respective sister States of the North and South. Prominent among these perpetuating causes, have been the antagonistic system of Slavery and Free Labor. The first necessitates ignorant, careless, and forced labor, which is necessarily agricultural, and desolates large tracts of land. The latter implies small freeholds, intelligent labor, and enriching agriculture, or not less profitable manufactures. The first depresses and degrades the body of the people, the last tends to social equality by the instruction and elevation of all. The one supplies the most favorable conditions of local self-government by townships; the other can seldom descend to more diffused government than that of a county.

Virginia was organized into eight counties as early as 1634, and from her the County System appears to have spread over all the present Slave States—(South Carolina, however, is organized in "Districts" and Louisiana in "Parishes") and many of the Free. At the present time we believe the Township System is found in none of the Slave States, but has a foothold at least in all the free—a fact confirmatory of the remark just made concerning their respective labor systems.

Massachusetts appears to have been hardly behind in effecting Town Organization. Practically indeed she had it from the beginning. The first formal document we find on the subject, however, is the following from the "orders" in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay:

"Att the General Court holden at Newe Towne, March 3, 1635: Whereas, pticular townes have many things wch concerne onely themselves, & the ordering of their owne affairs and disposing of business in their own towne, it is therefore ordered that the freemen of eury towne or the major pts of them shall onely have power to dispose of their owne lands & woods, with all the previlidges & appurtenances of the said townes, to grant lotts & make such orders as may concerne the well ordering of their owne townes, not repugnant to the laws and orders here established by the Generall Court; as also to lay mulks & penaltys for the breach of theis orders, & to levy & distriene the same, not exceeding the some of xx s.; also to chuse their owne pticular officers, as constables, surveyors, for the high wayes and the like."

Of a similar purport are the following extracts from "The Body of Liberties of the Massachusetts Colony in New England, enacted by the General Court, 1641."

* * * * *

"62. Any shire or towne shall have liberty to choose their deputies, whom and where they please, for the General Court;

* * * * *

"66. The freemen of every township shall have power to make such by-laws and constitutions as concern the welfare of their town, provided they be not of a criminal, but only of a prudential nature; and that their penalties exceed not twenty shillings for one offence;

"74. The freemen of every township shall have full power to choose yearly, or for a less time, out of themselves, a convenient number of fit men to order the planting or prudential occasions of that town according to instructions given them in writing."

These, we may suppose to be the formal origin of the New England towns, whose *aggregation* formed Counties and States, so primary was the system. "Each settlement," says HILDRETH, "at once assumed that township authority, which has ever formed so marked a feature in the political organization of New England. The people assembled in town meeting, voted taxes for local purposes, and chose three, five, or seven of the principal inhabitants, at first under other names, but early known as "select-men," who had the expenditure of this money, and the executive management of town affairs. A treasurer and town clerk were also chosen, and a constable was soon added for the service of civil and criminal cases. Each town constituted, in fact, a little republic, almost complete in itself."

The system spread over New England without material change; into New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota. New York added a Board of Supervisors, and the system of that State has been followed mainly by Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. New Jersey follows it in some respects, but does not appear to have a very efficient system. Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, have an imperfect organization. So, too, we believe has Iowa.

The county system, however, originally prevailed in Illinois, having spread here from Virginia. Previous to its conquest in 1778, by Gen. Geo. Rogers Clark, there was probably no local government in the country, and only a military rule of any kind. Capt. Philip Pittman, in his "Present State of the European Settlements on the Mississippi," published in 1770, says: "This country, (Illinois,) when in possession of the French, was governed by a military officer, called the Major-Commandant, who was appointed by the Governor of New Orleans." The English, while in power, endeavored, but without success, to establish civil and local magistrates. In 1778, Illinois was made a county of Virginia, and governed by a County Lieutenant—JOHN TODD being first appointed to that office. In 1784, it was ceded to the United States by Virginia, and, by the Ordinance of 1787, it was made, with other territory lying north of the Ohio, the North-Western Territory, of which St. Clair was first Governor. In 1798, at the meeting of the first Territorial Legislature, Illinois composed a part of Knox county, and was represented by SHADRACH BOND. In 1800, it became a part of Indiana Territory, and was composed of part of the county of Knox, just mentioned, and of the counties of St. Clair, formed in 1790, and Randolph,

formed in 1795. By the laws of that Territory, (published in 1807,) the Court of Common Pleas (composed of three Judges in each county,) was authorized to divide the counties into townships, and establish boundaries to the same. It does not appear, however, that this was ever done. In 1809, Illinois became a separate Territory, composed of the counties of St. Clair and Randolph, and in 1812 the Territorial Legislature held its first session, in which the four additional counties of Madison, Gallatin, Pope, and Johnson, created the same year, were represented, with the exception, perhaps, of Pope. The Legislature, in 1818, passed a bill incorporating townships for school purposes. Edwards county was erected in this year, and White, Monroe, and Jackson, in 1815-6; and Crawford, Bond, Union, Washington, and Franklin, in 1817-8, making in all fifteen counties represented in the Constitutional Convention of 1818. In this Convention, provision was made for a supervision of local affairs, by County Commissioners; (Schedule Section IV:)

"There shall be elected in each county three County Commissioners, for the purpose of transacting county business, whose time of service, power, and duties, shall be regulated and defined by law."

These continued to transact county business for a period of nearly thirty years. Meanwhile, however, a new current of emigration began to flow into the State. Kentucky and Virginia had furnished a large portion of the early settlers. The emigration into Northern Illinois now begun, was principally from the Eastern and Middle States, where the town system prevailed. Accordingly, in the Constitutional Convention of 1847, there were propositions from various quarters for a change, which resulted in the substitution of a County Judge and two Associate Justices for the County Commissioners of the old Constitution, and in the adoption, as Sec. 6 of Art. VII of the new Constitution, of the following provision:

"The General Assembly shall provide, by general law, for a Township Organization, under which any county may organize whenever a majority of the voters of such county, at any general election, shall so determine; and whenever any shall adopt a Township Organization, so much of this constitution as provided for the management of the fiscal concerns of the said county, by the County Court, may be dispensed with, and the affairs of the said county may be transacted in such manner as the General Assembly may provide."

The General Assembly, at its next session, passed "An act to provide for Township and County Organization, under which any county may organize whenever a majority of voters at any general election shall so determine." Approved February 12, 1849. Twenty-five counties voted to organize under its provisions the same year, and one other in 1850.

The Legislature, at its next session, passed "An Act to provide for Township Organization," approved February 17, 1851, which is a re-enactment of the former law, with some modifications and additions. Amendments of this act were made at the sessions of

1853, 1854, 1855, and 1857. Under this Act, one additional county voted to organize, in 1851; five in 1852; three in 1853; one in 1854; two in 1855; three in 1856; three in 1867, and two in 1858. The following counties have adopted the system:

Adams, Boone, Brown, Bureau, Carroll, Clark, Cook, De Kalb, Du Page, Edgar, Fulton, Grundy, Hancock, Henry, Iroquois, Jo Daviess, Kane, Kankakee, Kandall, Knox, Lake, La Salle, Lawrence, Lee, Livingston, McDonough, McHenry, McLean, Marshall, Mercer, Ogle, Peoria, Pike, Putnam, Richland, Rock Island, Schuyler, Stark, Stephenson, Tazewell, Vermillion, Warren, Whiteside, Will, Winnebago, Woodford—being forty-six out of the one hundred counties, containing a population of 796,764, out of 1,300,251, according to the census of 1855, being about eight-thirteenthths, or nearly two-thirds of our people. They include all the counties north of the Illinois river, with the exception of Calhoun. On the south side they come within one tier of counties of a line drawn through Springfield, and on the east side of the State, run down as low as the Ohio and Mississippi Railroad, Lawrence and Richland being southernmost. None of these counties have returned to the old system, save Hancock, and that did so only for a brief period.

At the late session (1859) of the Legislature, an Act was prepared and nearly passed, which reduced the Township Organization law with its several amendments to one Act, and added desirable features; but this met the fate of many others in the party strife, which put an end to the session. We are obliged, therefore, to rely upon an octavo pamphlet of about 180 pages, edited by Hon. ELIJAH M. HAINES, of Lake county, (published by KEEN & LEE, of Chicago, in 1857. Price 50 cents in paper) entitled "A Compilation of all the General Laws of the State of Illinois, relative to Township Organization," &c., as the latest and best authority in regard to the law. With this as our guide, we shall proceed to give the outline of its features, referring the readers to the work itself for details.

The submission of the question of Township Organization is first provided for. Upon petition of fifty voters residing in any county, the County Court is required at the next general election to submit the question to the people. Should a majority of the whole number of votes cast at the election be "For Township Organization," the system is adopted. Those who do not vote for it, are counted against it. If 4,000 votes are cast, 2,000 of which are for the system, and 1,000 against it, while 1,000 remain neutral, it would be defeated by their inactivity. It is desirable, therefore, for all to inquire into and understand the subject, inasmuch as they *must be* friends or foes at the ballot-box.

Should Township Organization be adopted, the County Court, at its next session, is required to appoint three Commissioners, who proceed to divide the county into townships, following as far as may be, the government surveys. Fractional townships, and parts of whole townships, that are separated by rivers or creeks,

from the remainder may be added to other townships. The towns are named in accordance with the will of their respective voters, if expressed—no two towns in the State to have the same name. If not, the Commissioners may designate a name. They report on or before the first day of the succeeding March, to the County Clerk, who makes out notices for each township, designating a suitable place of meeting, on the first Tuesday of April next thereafter.

Townships thus organized are *quasi* corporations, that is, "have a corporate capacity only for a particular specified end." Their powers are—

1. To sue and be sued.
2. To purchase lands.
3. To make necessary contracts.
4. To regulate its corporate property.

Each township is an election precinct, and the Supervisor, Assessor, and Collector, are ex-officio Judges of Election.

It is governed by its voters assembled in "town meeting," on the first Tuesday in April of each year. At these, electors, after having appointed a presiding officer, called a Moderator, have power—

1. To determine number of pounds, &c., if any.
2. To elect town officers.
3. To direct law-suits of township.
4. To raise money for same.
5. To regulate fences and the impounding of animals.
6. To regulate stock running at large.
7. To impose penalties upon offenders against each regulation.
8. To apply such penalties to public use.

Special meetings may be called when necessary.

The Township Officers, elected at these annual meetings, are—

1. A Supervisor.
2. A Town Clerk.
3. An Assessor.
4. A Collector.
5. An Overseer of the Poor.
6. Three Commissioners of Highways.
7. Two Constables.
8. Two Justices of the Peace.

9. An Overseer of Highways for each road district, into which the township is divided.

10. Pound Masters, should it be determined to have any.

All these must have been inhabitants of the township for one year, and are elected annually, with the exception of the Justice of the Peace and Constable, who serve four years. If, when elected, a Supervisor, Town Clerk, Assessor, Commissioner of Highways, or Overseer of the Poor, refuse to serve, he pays to the Township a penalty of twenty-five dollars. An Overseer of Highways or Pound Master, ten dollars. Justices, Constables, and Collectors, seem to be exempt from such fine. The Town

Clerk, Overseer of the Poor, and Commissioners of Highways, receive for service in the township one dollar, and for service without the township one dollar and fifty cents *per diem*. The Assessor receives one dollar and fifty cents.

The Supervisor is paid one dollar and fifty cents for town business, and not more than two dollars for county business.

The Town Clerk for certain duties is paid by fees; so, of course, are the Justices of the Peace and the Constables; also, the Pound Masters. The Collector receives three per cent. of the amount collected by him. The duties of these various officers I shall now enumerate:

The Supervisor appears to perform two functions. First, he is a Township Treasurer, receiving the bonds of Collector and Constable, receiving and paying over all moneys raised for township purposes, except those raised for highways and bridges, prosecuting for all penalties under fifty dollars, not assigned to another officer, receiving accounts against the township, and on the Tuesday preceding the annual town meeting, laying his accounts before the Justices of the Peace and Town Clerk, with whom he constitutes the Board of Auditors, of which more hereafter; secondly, he is a representative of the township in the County Board of Supervisors, before which he brings business appertaining to his township, and controlled by that body, and with which he participates in the management of the affairs of the county.

With two other Supervisors, he may constitute a Board of Appeals on road matters of another town; and is *ex-officio* Judge of Election. An Assistant Supervisor is chosen when a township has more than eight hundred voters, and has no powers except as a member of the Board of Supervisors.

The Town Clerk has custody of all records, books, and papers of the town; keeps record of all transactions of town meetings; gives notice of special town meetings; calls to order, and proclaims the adjournment of the same; is clerk of election; notifies officers of their election; delivers to the Supervisor, before the annual meeting of the Board of Supervisors, copies of all entries of votes for raising money; keeps an Estray book, and performs various minor duties.

The Assessor of each township is required to meet those of other townships at the office of the County Clerk, on the last Saturday in April, to receive blanks and consult with one another, and with the County Clerk, upon a basis upon which the property in each township shall be taxed. Between the first days of May and July, the Assessor ascertains, "by diligent inquiry," the names of taxable persons and the taxable real and personal property; and makes up, by the first of August, the "Assessment Roll," which, by due notice, is submitted to the inhabitants of the township for correction, on a named day, before himself, the Supervisor, and Town Clerk, and having been thus corrected, if need be, in behalf of any who choose to appear, it is returned, by the first of September, to the County Clerk, who lays a fair

copy of all the assessment rolls, before the Board of Supervisors at their annual meeting, who regulate and equalize the various assessments and fix the rate upon the hundred dollars in the several towns. The County Clerk estimates the amount of tax for each person on the assessment roll, and transmits the list of each town to the Township Collector by the fifteenth of November.

The Assessor is *ex-officio* Judge of Elections.

The Collector collects the taxes in his township, and after retaining his commission of three per cent., pays to the Commissioners of Highways, the Supervisor, Township Treasurer of School Money, and the County Treasurer, the amounts due them for roads, other town expenses, schools, and State and county tax. He makes return by the fifteenth of February. The Collector is *ex-officio* Judge of Elections.

The Overseer of the Poor has no duties defined in the act. They are easily surmised. He has, by subsequent enactment, power to bind poor children, and to watch over and protect their interests.

The Commissioners of Highways have the care and superintendence of bridges and highways in their township. Their powers and duties are—

1. To give directions for repairing of roads and bridges.
2. To regulate and alter roads.
3. To legalize unrecorded highways twenty years used.
4. To cause highways and bridges to be kept in repair.
5. To divide townships into road districts.
6. To assign inhabitants to road districts.
7. To require Overseers of Highways to work the roads.

They can impose a road tax not exceeding twenty cents on the hundred dollars, and have charge of road-fines, &c. With the Assessor, they are *ex-officio* fence-viewers, and have other powers which need not be specified. They are accountable to the Board of Auditors.

The duties of Justices of the Peace and of Constables, are the same as under the present system.

The duties of Overseers of Highways are—

1. To keep in order the highways in their respective districts.
2. To warn all persons from whom road labor is due, to work on the highways.
3. To collect fines and commutation money, and execute lawful orders of the Commissioners of Highways.
4. To deliver to the Town Clerk, within sixteen days of their election, a certified list of persons liable to road labor.

The Overseers of Highways have the same duties as our present Supervisors. One is elected for each road district in the township.

Pound Masters are only needed where cattle, &c., are not suffered to run at large. Their duties need not be here enumerated.

The Board of Auditors is composed of the Supervisor, Town Clerk, and Justices of the Peace, in each town. They meet semi-

annually—in April and September, to audit accounts, charges, and damages, against the town, and certify the whole amount of charges to be levied on the property of the town, to the Board of Supervisors.

The Board of Supervisors, composed of the Supervisors of the several towns, meets on the second Monday in September, annually, at the county seat. Their powers are, the county being also a *quasi* corporation:

1. To regulate corporate property of the county.
2. To audit and make appropriations for accounts.
3. To audit and make appropriations for accounts against towns, not otherwise provided for.
4. To appropriate funds for bridges.
5. To perform other duties not inconsistent with this act.

They regulate and equalize the assessment of the various Assessors; fix the rate of taxation; may impose a county tax for county purposes; regulate boundaries of towns, &c. The County Clerk is Clerk of the Board, receiving suitable compensation.

This rather imperfect analysis of the law may suffice to give a sufficiently clear idea of the peculiarities of the proposed system. I proceed to enumerate some of the principal differences between it and the county system.

In comparing the town and county systems of government, I shall consider the objections raised by those who oppose the town system, and, in answering them, point out its advantages. These objections, it will be noticed, turn entirely on practice, and do not dispute the theoretical correctness of township organization. From this fact it may be safely inferred that experience and training, under the new system, will remove them bodily.

1. It is affirmed, to begin with, that our Township Organization System is too complex, and requires too many officers—that “too many cooks spoil the broth.” It may be well, first, to examine into the facts. First: is there really any more labor done by many town officers than by a few county officers? Let us suppose not: it is, nevertheless, performed with that special knowledge, dexterity, and quickness, attending the division of labor. An Assessor or Collector, whose residence is in a given township, can manifestly do his work quicker and better than one who resides at a distance. He is, moreover, the choice of the people, not the appointee of the County Assessor. It seems as though such a multiplicity of officers would not be injurious. Secondly: the Board of Supervisors, concerning which much noise is made, as being a large and expensive body, is composed of say, six times as many men, (sixteen is about the average number of towns to a county,) meeting one-quarter as often, sitting about half as long, and paid about one-half as much per man, (possibly two-thirds,) the rates being, as regards expense, therefore, as $18 \times 1 \times 1 \times 1$: $3 \times 4 \times 2 \times 2$ or as 18:48—a formula which mathematical men may consider as giving a very decided argument *in favor* of Township Organization.

But admitting the full force of the objection, it has not been the most simple governments that have proved the best. The autocracy of the Czar is one of the most simple governments extant. None is more illogical and complicated than that of England.

2. A second objection urged is that the burden of making roads, and particularly building bridges, would fall unequally upon the various towns. We reply, certainly not more so than now. Do not, sometimes, yea often, the taxes of an unbridged part of the county go to pay for bridges in another portion? And to whom would the building a bridge more properly belong than to the inhabitants of the town in which it stands, and who would, as a general rule, most use it? And if there *were* cases where towns needed assistance, the Board of Supervisors is empowered to give it, and doubtless generally would.

3. A third objection is that the new system would be more expensive. Is this a fact? Perhaps at first it might be so. The introduction of new systems and new laws generally create extra expense, until they are fairly in operation. It is possible, too, that the inhabitants of some towns, *knowing where their money would be spent*, would tax themselves more freely, to make their roads and bridges good, and for other works of public utility. But I believe the general argument already advanced—that town officers, in the rural districts, and under the immediate eye of their constituents, would be more apt to be frugal and honest—still holds good.

4. Another difficulty advanced, is that men would be unwilling to hold these small offices. Such is not the general experience, I would be willing to affirm, in those regions where the town system exists. Offices generally, however insignificant, are seldom without aspirants, more as an object of ambition than a means of gain; and those who seek them generally desire to perform their duties. These have the great merit of offering few inducements to the avarice of corrupt men. This matter has been already partly tested by experience. At the present time we do not find much difficulty in getting good men to fill the offices of township school trustees and treasurers. So far as is known, they are nearly always men of integrity; often of ability.

5. A fifth objection is the incapacity, or rather ignorance, of the inhabitants of many townships. If it were desired to offer an argument in favor of Township Organization, this *objection* is one of the strongest. Granting it to be the fact (which most men, who will consider the men of their own townships, will deny,) it is certain that no means could be devised or be more desirable to educate them in that political knowledge which is indispensable to every American citizen, than to give them the management of their own affairs. They cannot learn too soon.

6. Another argument much advanced in opposition is that cattle and other stock cannot, under Township Organization, run at large. This is the general form of the objection, and is incorrect. The townships merely have power, upon a *vote of the majority* of

the inhabitants to prevent such stock from running at large as they may desire. There is nothing unfair in this, should they haply choose to do so; and the expense of keeping our hogs up, for instance, would certainly be very much less than it now costs to fence them out. But this matter is entirely optional with the inhabitants of a township. They need never prohibit cattle from running at large, unless they choose.

7. Another objection advanced in this county, is our sparseness of population. This need be mentioned only to state that, throwing out Alton, our towns would probably average in Madison, 1,000 inhabitants, and 200 voters, which does not much vary from the average size of all the towns in the State according to the census of 1855. The average is probably a good deal increased by an increased population, since that time.

Such are the arguments to which the opponents of the system are reduced. They would scarcely be worth refutation did they not have considerable effect upon the minds of those who have not yet had opportunity to examine for themselves.

The objections to the county system, are in part as follows:

1. The County Court is but imperfectly a representative body, and does not appreciate, understand, and look after the interests of every part of the county, equally with those parts from which the three members come. This is a fact known to all. And inasmuch as the county seat and certain parts of the extreme of the county, generally furnish the three members of the County Court, certain districts are, for long periods, quite neglected, in county legislation. The Board of Supervisors, in which every township is represented by a person having a direct interest in its welfare, seems altogether preferable.

2. The management of Roads and Bridges is unsatisfactory. Bridges are badly built at a great expense, and road districts are badly managed. It is conceded that a township would be more economical and thorough in this respect, (on account of the more immediate interest of its citizens,) both in paying for the work and making use of the results.

3. The Assessment and Collection of Taxes is not well done. A County Assessor must employ assistants who assess two or more townships each, and often make careless and imperfect returns. The collection of taxes requires the personal attendance of the tax payer, and much waste of time both by him and the collectors. In these respects the town system commends itself to our favor.

These are inherent evils of the county system.

In conclusion, here are a few opinions of gentlemen in this State, concerning the actual workings of Township organization:

1. A gentleman of Ogle county speaks as follows of the Board of Supervisors, concerning which most anxiety appears to be felt: "I have attended meetings of the Board of Supervisors in this county, as Supervisor from this town, and know that the Board is so arranged in its manner of doing the county business, as to

combine great dispatch of business with great correctness in accomplishing the same."

2. A gentleman of Bureau county, which has been organized in towns since 1849, writes as follows, to a friend in Madison: "I learn from Sheriff NORTON, * * and others, that the Town Organization works well generally, and in this town, (Princeton,) first rate. They say the people would not return to the old plan under any consideration."

3. Here is the testimony of a resident of Tazewell county: "In reply to information wanting about Township Organization, we think it far preferable to the county plan. First we have the collection of our own taxes in each town. Then if there is any error in listing property, it can be more easily rectified. The assessments are generally more correct than those made by county assessors. Supporting our own poor we think a great saving, as most of the paupers are made and found in large river towns. Hence there is not that chance to impose on us that there is under the county Supervision. * * * It is said by our Supervisor, that each town being represented in the Supervisor's Court, the wants of each can be attended to without doing injustice to any. In County Commissioners' Courts, parts of the county, thinly settled, are frequently entirely neglected without any remedy."

4. The Hon. E. M. HAINES, of Lake county, who has probably given this subject more attention than any other man in the State, writes thus: "I am so much in favor of the system that I can point out no defect. It is a system by which the people govern themselves, and among an intelligent people ought to be considered the most perfect system of government. * * * It is no more expensive than the county system in our State. The township system is the most prudent and economical system that can possibly be adopted, when once understood. * * * The system gives perfect satisfaction so far as my knowledge extends. The only complaint I have ever heard is that the Board of Supervisors is somewhat expensive in counties having a large number of towns, but it will be found in every instance that the expenses of counties adopting the system are not so much as in those which are under the old system."

5. A gentleman of Springfield, who commenced a canvass of the opinions of the members of the late Legislature, who were from counties adopting Township organization, says: "I found opportunity to talk to a few only * * * all agreeing that the new system was more *impartial, practically cheaper*, and especially profitable as a *political engine* for the elaboration of the best policy and as a school for the education of the State."

Here then, we have the summing up of the whole matter:

1. Local self-government is abstractly considered theoretically right.

2. It has been unreservedly approved by such men as ADAMS, JEFFERSON, KENT, WEBSTER, and DE TOCQUEVILLE.

3. It has been found in those countries where freedom prevails, as an important source and support of free institutions.

4. Under the form of Township Organization, it has, under a good law, been proved by more than half the inhabitants of our State, and met with their approval.

Such being the facts, let us adopt Township Organization.

APPENDIX I.

COUNTIES IN ILLINOIS THAT HAVE ADOPTED TOWNSHIP ORGANIZATION.

NAME.	VOTED.	NO. OF POPULATION	
		TOWNS.	IN 1855.
Adams.....	November 6, 1849	20	34,311
Boone.....	November 6, 1849	8	10,994
Brown.....	November 6, 1849	10	7,940
Bureau.....	November 6, 1849	24	19,518
Carroll.....	November 6, 1849	15	7,610
Clark.....	November 2, 1852	13	13,863
Cook.....	November 6, 1849	27	103,960
De Kalb.....	November 6, 1849	15	13,636
DuPage.....	November 6, 1849	9	12,307
Edgar.....	November 4, 1857	12	13,920
Fulton.....	November 6, 1849	26	27,968
Grundy.....	November 6, 1849	14	7,021
Hancock.....	November 6, 1849	19	22,158
Henry.....	November 4, 1856	24	9,218
Iroquois.....	November 6, 1855	17	6,788
Jo Daviess.....	November 2, 1852	19	24,104
Kane.....	November 6, 1849	16	26,665
Kankakee.....	November 2, 1852	14	10,110
Kendall.....	November 6, 1849	9	10,145
Knox.....	November 2, 1852	20	22,847
Lake.....	November 6, 1849	15	17,630
La Salle.....	November 6, 1849	30	35,563
Lawrence.....	November 4, 1858	8	8,160
Lee.....	November 6, 1849	15	11,618
Livingston.....	November 4, 1857	20	4,606
McDonough.....	November 4, 1856	16	12,886
McHenry.....	November 6, 1849	17	19,285
McLean.....	November 2, 1858	28	19,578
Marshall.....	November 6, 1849	10	9,900
Mercer.....	November 8, 1853	15	9,660
Ogle.....	November 6, 1849	22	16,456
Peoria.....	November 6, 1849	19	30,134
Pike.....	November 6, 1849	21	23,351
Putnam.....	November 6, 1855	4	5,100
Richland.....	November 2, 1858	9	7,049
Rock Island.....	November 4, 1856	15	16,217
Schuyler.....	November 8, 1853	13	12,296
Stark.....	November 2, 1852	8	6,293
Stephenson.....	November 6, 1849	16	13,316
Tazewell.....	November 6, 1849	19	17,371
Vermillion.....	November 5, 1850	13	15,893
Warren.....	November 8, 1853	15	12,209
Whiteside.....	November 4, 1851	24	13,416
Will.....	November 6, 1849	16	24,468
Winnebago.....	November 6, 1849	16	20,826
Woodford.....	November 7, 1854	14	8,400
Counties, 46		734	796,764

Average number of inhabitants to a town.....	1,085
Average number of towns to a county.....	16
Largest number of towns in one county, (LaSalle).....	30
Smallest number of towns in one county, (Putnam).....	4

APPENDIX II.

AREAS, POPULATION, &c., OF TOWNSHIPS IN MADISON COUNTY.

	<i>Town.</i>	<i>Areas.</i>	<i>Pop. '55.</i>	<i>Militia '55.</i>
Highland.....	3 5	22,998.56	2,122	433
Saline	4 5	22,562.58	974	184
	5 5	18,532.91	130	29
Toluca.....	6 5	15,967.15	288	40
St. Jacobs.....	3 6	22,691.15	1,199	231
Marine.....	4 6	22,394.18	1,287	283
Alhambra.....	5 6	22,162.21	596	110
Moultonville.....	6 6	20,087.15	572	102
Troy.....	3 7	21,713.34	1,436	331
	4 7	22,142.96	460	93
Omphghent P. O.....	5 7	23,173.41	612	94
Lamb's Point, Omphghent School House, Prairie City.....	6 7	21,494.65	528	78
Collinsville.....	3 8	22,452.85	1,771	413
Edwardsville	4 8	22,515.74	1,894	397
Liberty Prairie, Paddock's Grove.....	5 8	23,359.24	1,139	219
Ridgeley, Moro, Dorsey's.....	6 8	20,573.13	578	118
Six Mile.....	3 9	22,600.ap	968	327
Madison.....	4 9	19,834.08	650	194
Upper Alton, Bethalto.....	5 9	21,030.54	2,443	574
Fosterburg	6 9	20,207.64	1,012	173
Venice.....	3 10	7,000.ap	500	173
	4 10	1,349.25	107	35
Alton.....	5 10	4,013.51	8,457	
Monticello.....	6 10	20,459.63	1,843	382
		461,315.86	31,556	

A regular township contains 23,040 acres.

APPENDIX III.

VOTES ON TOWNSHIP ORGANIZATION IN MADISON COUNTY.

PRECINCTS.	1849.			1857.			1858.		
	FOR.	AGAINST.	NEUTRAL.	FOR.	AGAINST.	NEUTRAL.	FOR.	AGAINST.	NEUTRAL.
Alhambra				10	57	18	23	25	54
Alton	90	34	242	266	190	224	574	80	447
Bethalto	3	16	10	17	52	41	16	142	41
Collinsville	65	16	52	189	14	92	234	6	23
Edwardsville	14	141	79	24	234	113	48	300	186
Highland	2	39	37	163	12	106	57	11	223
Looking Glass	143	14	47			82	45	64	11
Madison	12		14	22	3	15	12	96	15
Marine	4	72	37	103	58	33	128	77	29
Monticello	3	36	8	88	3	6	142	26	18
Omphghent				36	37	9	39	95	19
Saline	22	13	9	41		3	57	11	7
Six Mile	8	10	48	13	3	12	58	65	33
Silver Creek	8	47	46			49	8	52	5
Troy	44	51	70	19	104	51	27	114	62
Upper Alton	31	99	150	152	102	51	249	70	94
White Rock				5	62	14	14	94	11
	401	654	850	1148	928	916	1731	1138	1278

	1849.	1857.	1858.
For Township Organization	401	1,148	1,734
Against Township Organization	654	928	1,138
Neutral (about)	1,000	919	1,278
TOTAL VOTE	2,055	2,995	4,146
Necessary to success	1,028	1,498	2,074
Minority	627	350	343



6/10 ✓

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 07770 190 0



